

Remarks

Claims 1, 4, 5-10, 12 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor. Applicants respectfully traverse rejection.

It is the examiner's position that the claims merely recite that the rear portion "has the ability" to engage a bore. The examiner then states that "the rear portion of the device of Taylor **is clearly** capable of engaging a bore of a firing device". Accordingly, the examiner concludes that the structure of Taylor anticipates the claims at issue.

Taylor discloses a bomb that is dropped from an aircraft. While Taylor discloses that the bomb may be stored in a launching tube, there is no disclosure or suggestion of any portion of Taylor engaging with the launching tube in order to induce relative rotation between the vanes 19 and the body 5. Thus, Taylor clearly does not disclose or suggest the claimed portion that engages a bore of a firing device to induce relative rotation.

Applicants have now amended the claims to further and more clearly define that a portion of the claimed device engages a bore of a firing device when the projectile is fired in order to induce relative rotation between the two claimed portions. Applicants submit the claims clearly define of the structure disclosed in Taylor. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-10, 14, 15 and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alford et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants note the projectile disclosed in Alford et al. is designed to be fired from a bore. However, there is no specific teaching of a bore engaging portion or a portion that engages with the bore to cause relative rotation between the two portions as now specifically claims. Accordingly, Alford et al. cannot anticipate the claims at issue.

Applicants note claims 2 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, but Taylor clearly also does not disclose or suggest the bore engaging portion of claims 1 and 8 as now claimed upon which claims 2 and 12 depend. Accordingly, the reference cannot form the basis for finding the claims prima facie obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In view of the above, all of the claims, in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance notice of which is respectfully urged. The examiner, however, may contact the undersigned by telephone should any minor issue remain outstanding after entry of this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

09 OCTOBER 2008  
DATE

*Marc A. Rossi*  
MARC A. ROSSI  
REG. NO. 31,923  
P.O. BOX 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)